

Sanitized

JAN 14 1964

328

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 14

FOIAb3b

Mr. COOPER. I want to make the point that the Committee did not make any findings upon the effectiveness of filters.

To make certain that I was correct, I wrote a letter yesterday to Dr. Luther Terry, the Surgeon General. I asked if he would respond as quickly as possible. I received a letter from him today which verifies what I have said. I will read the letter. Then I shall ask that my letter and his reply be placed in the body of the RECORD.

The letter is dated January 14, 1963:

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: This is in response to your letter of January 13 which poses certain questions as to the Advisory Committee's views on cigarette filters. Certainly, it is erroneous to conclude that cigarette filters have no effect. As noted in the Committee's report, filters in common use do remove a variable portion of the tars and nicotine. Your specific questions and our replies will follow:

1. Is it not correct that the Advisory Committee made no judgment as to the effect of adding filters to cigarettes?

Answer. Yes.

2. Do I understand correctly that the Committee made no finding on filters because it believed it had insufficient evidence from animal experiments, clinical studies, or population studies—the three kinds of evidence it considered—on which to base any findings as to the effect of the various types of filters?

Answer. Yes.

3. To the extent that a filter removes tar, nicotine, and the gaseous elements of cigarette smoke, is it not reasonable to assume that the effects of the filter will be similar to the effects reported by the Committee of smoking fewer cigarettes?

Answer. A categorical answer to this question is difficult. The best I could do would be to answer "Yes—perhaps," or "Yes—probably." A part of the problem here is whether the filter in addition to removing tar, nicotine or other elements of cigarette smoke might also lead to different levels of cigarette consumption and different amounts of inhalation, etc. Another difficulty is that we do not know all of the substances which different filters do or do not remove. Since we do not yet know all of the substances in tobacco smoke which have adverse health effects, a given filter might permit the selective passage of hazard substances, as well as selectively removing others.

4. Does not the limited discussion of a new-type filter, on page 61 of the report, suggest that the Advisory Committee believes that the development of selective filters may have significance in terms of reducing the hazards to health the Committee believes it has found?

Answer. Yes; the Committee felt that the development of better filters or more selective filters is a promising avenue for further development.

5. Would not standardized research on the effectiveness and selectivity of filters, as well as additional research on the components of smoke, be desirable?

Answer. Yes, unquestionably.

I hope these responses will be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER L. TERRY,
Surgeon General.

My comment on this is that those who study this report must be careful not to extend the conclusions of the Committee.

No findings were made with respect to filters. It is important that further study and research be conducted on the question of filters. Dr. Terry has stated that the Committee felt that the devel-

opment of better or more selective filters is a promising avenue. I urge that research in this area be expanded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the two letters will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The letters ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
January 13, 1964.

DR. LUTHER L. TERRY,
Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. TERRY: The report on smoking and health, and the press conference Saturday, January 11, by the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General appear to be widely interpreted as having included a finding that cigarette filters have no effect. On the contrary:

1. Is it not correct that the Advisory Committee made no judgment as to the effect of adding filters to cigarettes?

2. Do I understand correctly that the Committee made no finding on filters because it believed it had insufficient evidence from animal experiments, clinical studies, or population studies—the three kinds of evidence it considered—on which to base any finding as to the effect of the various types of filters?

3. To the extent that a filter removes tar, nicotine, and the gaseous elements of cigarette smoke, is it not reasonable to assume that the effects of the filter will be similar to the effects reported by the Committee of smoking fewer cigarettes?

4. Does not the limited discussion of a new-type filter, on page 61 of the report, suggest that the Advisory Committee believes that the development of selective filters may have significance in terms of reducing the hazards to health the Committee believes it has found?

5. Would not standardized research on the effectiveness and selectivity of filters, as well as additional research on the components of smoke, be desirable?

Because the report of your Advisory Committee is the subject of wide and general interest, it will be helpful to have your answers, at least to the first question, as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: This is in response to your letter of January 13 which poses certain questions as to the Advisory Committee's views on cigarette filters. Certainly, it is erroneous to conclude that cigarette filters have no effect. As noted in the Committee's report, filters in common use do remove a variable portion of the tars and nicotine. Your specific questions and our replies will follow:

1. Is it not correct that the Advisory Committee made no judgment as to the effect of adding filters to cigarettes?

Answer. Yes.

2. Do I understand correctly that the Committee made no finding on filters because it believed it had insufficient evidence from animal experiments, clinical studies, or population studies—the three kinds of evidence it considered—on which to base any finding as to the effect of the various types of filters?

Answer. Yes.

3. To the extent that a filter removes tar, nicotine, and the gaseous elements of cigarette smoke, is it not reasonable to assume that the effects of the filter will be similar

to the effects reported by the Committee of smoking fewer cigarettes?

Answer. A categorical answer to this question is difficult. The best I could do would be to answer yes—perhaps, or yes—probably. A part of the problem here is whether the filter in addition to removing tar, nicotine or other elements of cigarette smoke might also lead to different levels of cigarette consumption and different amounts of inhalation, etc. Another difficulty is that we do not know all of the substances which different filters do or do not remove. Since we do not yet know all of the substances in tobacco smoke which have adverse health effects, a given filter might permit the selective passage of hazard substances, as well as selectively removing others.

4. Does not the limited discussion of a new-type filter, on page 61 of the report, suggest that the Advisory Committee believes that the development of selective filters may have significance in terms of reducing the hazards to health the Committee believes it has found?

Answer. Yes. The Committee felt that the development of better filters or more selective filters is a promising avenue for further development.

5. Would not standardized research on the effectiveness and selectivity of filters, as well as additional research on the components of smoke, be desirable?

Answer. Yes, unquestionably.

I hope these responses will be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER L. TERRY,
Surgeon General.

SAIGON SUMMARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article entitled "Saigon Summary" by Miss Marguerite Higgins, which appears in last week's issue of America magazine.

This is a shocking article; indeed, it would be almost incredible if it did not come from a correspondent of such exceptional stature. Although I am in no position to vouch for the accuracy of Miss Higgins' statements on every point, her article raises such serious questions about the conduct of American foreign policy that it cannot be dismissed or ignored. On the contrary, I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee should look into the charges and allegations made by Miss Higgins, and that Miss Higgins should be called before it as the first witness to report in more detail on her personal knowledge of the developments in Vietnam.

"Saigon Summary" is the story of the final days of the Diem regime, or, in Miss Higgins' words:

Of the inglorious role played by the Department of State by encouraging, for the first time in our history, the overthrow in time of war of a duly elected government fighting loyally against the common Communist enemy.

In her article, Miss Higgins makes the statement that the agitation about Buddhist persecution was a complete fraud and she charges, further, that the State Department knew that it was a fraud. She quotes Roger Hillsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, as telling her:

After the closing of the pagodas on August 21, the facts became irrelevant.

Miss Higgins, whose personal contacts are second to none in the Washington